(15)

SMITH VELMA T 05/05/82 084203 PRINTER: LI
81 STATE 152253

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED
PAGE 01 STATE 152253
ORIGIN NEA-11
INFO OCT-00 ADS-00 INR-10 EUR-12 SS-15 CIC-02 AF-10
CIAE-00 H-01 IO-15 NSCE-00 NSAE-00 HA-05 PM-09
PA-02 INRE-00 SAL-01 SIG-03 ACDA-12 SSN-02 SP-02
SPRS-02 /115 R
DRAFTED BY NEA/P:JTUOHEY
APPROVED BY S/S-O STRICKLER
PA:DFISCHER
NEA:MDUBBS
—
DESIRED DISTRIBUTION
NEA 11 COPIES

----------300264 110458Z /15

O R 110226Z JUN 81
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY AMMAN IMMEDIATE
USINT BAGHDAD IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BEIRUT IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY CAIRO IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY ISLAMABAD IMMEDIATE
AMCONSUL JERUSALEM IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY JIDDA IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY KUWAIT IMMEDIATE
INFO AMEMBASSY ALGIERS
AMCONSUL BOMBAY
AMCONSUL CALCUTTA
AMEMBASSY COLOMBO
AMEMBASSY DACCA
AMCONSUL KARACHI
AMCONSUL MADRAS
AMEMBASSY ABU DHABI
UNCLASSIFIED
UNCLASSIFIED
PAGE 02 STATE 152253
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMCONSUL DHAHRAN
AMEMBASSY DOHA
USMISSION GENEVA
AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MANAMA
AMEMBASSY MUSCAT
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY RABAT
AMEMBASSY SANAA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/HR
REVIEWED BY J.L. DATE 9/30/82
RDS☐ or XDS☐ EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. REASON(S)
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED☐ RELEASABLE☒
RELEASE DENIED☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

DECLASSIFIED

SMITH VELMA T 05/05/82 084203 PRINTER: LI
81 STATE 152253
UNCLASSIFIED
USMISSION SINAI
AMEMBASSY TUNIS
USMISSION USNATO
USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
USICA WASHDC
UNCLAS STATE 152253
E.O. 12065:N/A
TAGS:SOPN
SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFING JUNE 10, 1981
FOLLOWING ARE NEA EXCERPTS FROM DEAPRTMENT PRESS BRIEFING, JUNE 10, 1981. DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN TODAY DEAN FISCHER.
Q. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON ISRAEL, THE USE OF AMERICAN-MADE WEAPONS IN BOMBING THE IRAQI NUCLEAR REACTOR? IS IT COMPLETED, OR WHEN DO YOU EXPECT IT TO BE ANNOUNCED?
UNCLASSIFIED
UNCLASSIFIED
PAGE 03 STATE 152253
A. IT IS NOT YET COMPLETED. IT SHOULD BE GOING UP TO THE HILL EITHER TODAY OR TOMORROW.
Q. ARE YOU GOING TO MAKE THE REPORT PUBLIC AT THE TIME IT IS SENT TO THE HILL?
A. I AM UNDECIDED AS TO WHAT POINT IT WILL BE MADE PUBLIC, BUT I SHOULD THINK SHORTLY AFTER IT REACHES THE HILL IT WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
Q. HAS THERE BEEN ANY TENTATIVE HOLD PLACED ON THE AIRCRAFT IN TEXAS FOR THEIR DELIVERY TO ISRAEL, PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THIS REPORT?
A. NO. A DECISION IS STILL TO BE MADE, SPECIFICALLY WITH RESPECT TO THE F-16S. SO THE POINT IS, I THINK IT WOULD BE INACCURATE TO SAY THAT THERE HAS BEEN A HOLD; SIMPLY THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO DECISION OF ANY KIND MADE.
Q. DELIVERY IS MOVING ALONG WITHOUT ANY ALTERATION, ANY CHANGE?
A. THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE, THAT IS CORRECT.
Q. A PENTAGON OFFICIAL ON BACKGROUND THIS MORNING SAID THAT THE PLANES HAVE BEEN SUSPENDED, PENDING A DECISION BEING MADE. IS THAT ACCURATE OR NOT? I AM COMPLETELY CONFUSED BY WHAT YOU ARE SAYING HERE.
A. I AM SIMPLY SAYING THAT A DECISION WILL BE MADE, WHICH IS THE CONVERSE OF SAYING NO DECISION HAS BEEN MADE OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO THOSE AIRPLANES.
Q. THE CHRONOLOGY HERE IS INTERESTING, THAT FRIDAY WAS THE SLATED DAY TO BEGIN DELIVERY. NOW YOU ARE SAYING THAT THE REPORT WILL BE REALY TODAY OR TOMORROW. DO YOU TIE THESE
UNCLASSIFIED
UNCLASSIFIED
PAGE 04 STATE 152253
TWO ELEMENTS TOGETHER?
A. NO, NOT NECESSARILY. A DECISION HAS TO BE MADE WITH RESPECT TO THE REPORT, WHAT IT SAYS, AND A DECISION HAS

TO BE MADE WITH RESPECT TO THE AIRPLANES.
Q. BUT ARE NOT THE ELEMENTS IN BOTH OF THEM AT LEAST THE SAME?
A. THEY ARE TWO SEPARATE CONSIDERATIONS. OBVIOUSLY, THEY ARE BEING CONSIDERED SIMULTANEOUSLY, BUT I WOULD NOT NECESSARILY TIE THEM CLOSELY TOGETHER.
Q. IS THE ISRAELI AMBASSADOR COMING OVER THIS AFTERNOON FOR A MEETING WITH THE SECRETARY?
A. NOT THAT I AM AWARE OF.
Q. IS HE COMING OVER TO MEET ANYONE?
A. I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY PLANS FOR HIM TO MEET WITH ANYONE IN THE DEPARTMENT.
Q. WHEN YOU SAY "NO DECISION HAS BEEN MADE," IS THAT ACTUALLY, FACTUALLY THE CASE, GIVEN THE FACT THAT THERE WAS AN NSC MEETING THIS MORNING.
A. IT IS ACTUALLY, FACTUALLY THE CASE.
Q. DO YOU EXPECT THE REPORT TO AVOID MAKING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS TO OUTLINE OPTIONS?
A. I CAN'T SPECULATE ON THAT, JOHN, BECAUSE, AS I SAID

YESTERDAY AND IT STILL REMAINS THE CASE TODAY, THAT PROCESS IS NOT YET COMPLETED AS TO PRECISELY WHAT THE NOTIFICATION WILL SAY.
Q. DEAN, WHAT WOULD BE THE BASIS FOR WITHHOLDING THE F-16 DELIVERY?
A. I CAN'T GET INTO THAT. I DON'T HAVE ANY DETAILS I CAN OFFER TO YOU.
Q. IS THERE ANY LEGAL FOUNDATION FOR IT? COULD YOU TAKE THAT, PLEASE?
A. OKAY. FAIR ENOUGH.
Q. HAVE YOU BEEN INFORMED BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT THAT MORE FRENCH TECHNICIANS DIED IN THAT RAID THAN WAS ORIGINALLY BELIEVED?
A. NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.
Q. CAN YOU TAKE THAT?
A. YES.
Q. I WOULD LIKE TO BROADEN IT FROM JUST THESE FOUR FIGHTER PLANES. HAS THERE BEEN ANY DECISION WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION TO UNDERTAKE A REVIEW OF THE ARMS SALES POLICY TO ISRAEL?
A. I CAN'T GET INTO THAT BECAUSE IT AWAITS DECISIONS THAT HAVE TO BE MADE WITH RESPECT TO HOW WE PROCEED FROM HERE.
Q. YOU MEAN THERE'S BEEN NOT EVEN A DECISION ON WHETHER TO PUT ITEMS ON HELD UNTIL THERE IS A BROADER DECISION?

A. THAT'S CORRECT. NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE.
Q. WERE THE SAUDIS INFORMED IN THE LAST 48 HOURS THAT THE

AWACS NOTIFIVATION WILL BE GIVEN TO CONGRESS ON JULY 6?
A. NOT THAT T'M AWARE OF, NOR CAN I CONFIRM THE PREMISE OF YOUR QUESTION.
Q. HAS THE DECISION BEEN MALE BY THIS ADMINISTRATION TO SUBMIT THE AWACS THE WEEK OF JULY 6?
A. NOT HTAT I'M AWARE OF.
Q. THERE ARE PEOPLE ON THE HILL, INCLUDING HOWARD BAKER AND OTHERS, WHO ARE SAYING THAT THEY HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED THAT -- OR INFORMALLY -- THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WILL PRESENT THE AWACS TO THE HILL ON THE WEEK OF JULY 6.
A. I'LL BE GLAD TO TAKE IT.
Q. DEAN ON THE REPORT AGAIN TO CONGRESS, ARE YOU ONLY DEALIN WITH THE RAID AGAINST IRAQ, OR COVERING THE RAIDS AGAINST SOUTH LEBANON TOO?
A. NO. WE'RE DEALING EXCLUSIVELY WITH THE ATTACK THIS WEEK ON THE IRAQI INSTAILATION.
Q. BUT YOU ARE STILL LOOKING INTO THE POSSIBLE VIOLATION IN ITS RAIDS AGAINST LEBANON?
A. NO, NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.
Q. DEAN, YOU TOOK THAT QUESTION ABOUT A WEEK AGO OF THE

STRIKES AGAINST SOUTH LEBANON. YOU SAID YOU WOULD LOOK INTO IT AS TO WHETHER THERE WERE ANY VIOLATIONS.
A. YES.
Q. I MEAN THAT IS JUST KIND OF A FOLLOW-UP TO THIS.
A. THAT'S STILL UNDER REVIEW.
Q. DEAN, COULD I SHIFT THE FOCUS OF THIS SLIGHTLY? DOES THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FEEL THAT SIGNING THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY, SUBMITTING TO INTERNAITONAL ATOMIC ENERGY SAFEGUARDS AND HAVING FOREIGN TECHNICIANS AT A NUCLEAR REACTRO ARE SUFFICIENT SAFRGUARDS TO PREVENT THE PRODUCTION OF A NUCLEAR WEAPON OR THE DIVERSION OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL FOR MILITARY PURPOSES?
A. IT'S A VERY GOOD QUESTION, BUT I WOULD REFER YOU TO WHAT SAID ON THAT SUBJECT I THINK THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY. I HAVE NOTHING TO AIL TO THAT.
Q. DO YOU ANY COMMENT ON THE PRIME MINISTER BEGIN'S STATEMENT YESTERIAY THAT HE WILL DESTROY AGAIN ANY NUCLEAR FACILITIES IF IRAQ WILL REBUILD IT?
A. NO. I MAKE IT A HABIT OF NOT COMMENTING UPON THE STATEMENTS OF FOREIGN LEADER FROM THIS PODIUM.
Q. DEAN, TO FOLLOW UP ON LAR'S QUESTION, CAN THE U.S. -- WHICH IS ONE OF THE FOUNDERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY -- STATE THAT IT HAS CONFIDENCE IN THAT AGENCY' FUNCTIONS AT THIS POINT?
A. I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY REASON TO LACK CONFIDENCE.
Q. DEAN, ARE WE MAKING TOO MUCH OF THIS REPORT? IN OTHER

WORDS, THE LAW ONLY SAYS THAT THE PRESIDENT, AND I GUESS THORUGH THE SECRETARY OF STATE, SHOULD MAKE THE REPORT TO CONGRESS IF HE HAS RECEIVED INFORMATION THAT A VIOLATION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH ANOTHER COUNTRY MAY HAVE OCCURRED, PERIOD.
THAT IS ALL HE'S REQUIRED TO DO IN THAT "REPORT."
A. THAT IS CORRECT.
Q. THE REST OF IT ON PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION OF PERHAPS AN ARMS EMBARGO OR ANYTHING ELSE LIKE THAT, I SUPPOSE DOES NOT NECESSARILY HAVE TO BE IN THAT RECRT.
A. THAT IS CORRECT.
Q. DEAN, WHEN THE PENTAGON SPOKESMAN SAID YESTERDAY THAT THERE WAS NO QUESTION THAT A VIOLATION HAD OCCURRED, THE ONLY QUESTION WAS WHETHER IT WAS SUBSTANTIAL OR NOT. WAS IT SPEAKING FOR THE DEFENSE SECRETARY OR THE ADMINISTRATION OR WHO WAS HE SPEAKING FOR AT THAT POINT?
A. I HAVE TO ASSUME THAT THE PENTAGON SPOKESMAN SPEAKS FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.
Q. SO THAT IS NOT ADMINISTRATION POLICY. YOU HAVE NOW CONCLUDED THAT THERE WAS A VIOLATION, AND THE ONLY QUESTION WAS HOW SUBSTANTIAL. BECAUSE I NOTICE YOU JUST USED THE WORD "SUBSTANTIAL" WHEN DESCRIBING WHAT THIS REPORT HAD TO ADDRESS
A. RIGHT. MR. COTTO PRESUMABLY IS RELYING UPON THE SAME SOUCE I AM, WHICH IS THE LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTE.
Q. DEAN, AT THE TIME YOU READ THE STATEMENT CONDEMNING THE
UNCLASSIFIED

ISRAELI RAID, AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SEEN OR ASKED TO SEE THE HARD EVIDENCE WHICH THE ISRAELSI SAYS WAS THE BASIS FOR THE RAID?
A. WE HAD BEEN IN CONSULTATION WITH THE ISRAELIS SHORTLY AFTER WE WERE MADE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT THE ATTACK TOOK PLACE. WHEN YOU SPEAK OF "HARD EVIDENCE," I DON'T KNOW PRECISELY WHAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO.
Q. WELL, THEY SAY THEY HAD HARD EVIDENCE THAT THEY WERE BUILDING AN ATOMIC BOMB AND WERE GOING TO DROP IT ON ISRAEL
A. YES.
Q. -- AND THAT'S THE BASIS FOR THERI RAID.
A. YES.
Q. PRIOR TO YOUR READING THIS STATEMENT CONDEMNING THE RAID WHICH THE U.S. GOVERNMENT MADE PRIVY TO THE HARI EVIDENCE -- THE ISRAELI'S WORDS -- WHICH THEY SAY WAS THE BASIS FOR THE RAID?
A. WELL, I CAN'T REALLY COMMENT ON THAT BECAUSE IT WOULD GET INTO THE DIPLOMATIC EXCHANGES THAT WE HAVE BEEN HAVING WITH THE ISRAELIS FROM THE BEGINNING IN THIS REGARD.
Q. SO-- WHAT I'M GETTING AT: IS IT DANGEROUS TO CONCLUDE FROM THE CONDEMNATION THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT REJECTS THE ISRAELI RATIONALE FOR THE RAID?

A. WELL, I KNOW WHAT YOU'RE GETTING AT, BUT THE ONLY THING I CAN SAY IN RESPONSE TO THAT IS TO REFER YOU TO MY STATEMENT OF MONDAY. WE CERTAINLY STAND BY THATSTATEMENT.

Q. JUST FINALLY ON THIS: IN CONDEMNING THE RAID, ARE WE SAYING THAT REGARDLESS OF WHAT EVIDENCE THE ISRAELIS HAD THAT THE RAID SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED?
A. NO, NO. I DON'T THINK I WOULD PUT IT IN TERMS OF REGARDLWSS OF WHAT THE ISRAELIS SAID. WE MADE THE STATEMENT AND WE STAND BY THE STATEMENT.
Q. HAVE WE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH IRAQ OVER THIS MATTER IN THE LAST FEW DAYS; AND, IF SO, CAN YOU SAY HOW?
A. YES. I ADDRESSED THAT SUBJECT YESTERDAY. I BELIEVE I MENTIONED THAT THE CHIEF OF OUR INTEREST SECTION HAD BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THE IRAQI OFFICIALS ON THIS MATTER.
Q. HAVE THE IRAQUIS ASKED THE U.S. FOR ANY HELP?
A. TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO.
Q. THE IRAQIS HAVE PUT OUT A LONG STATEMENT, THEIR IRAQI NEWS AGENCY SAYING THEIR FOREIGN MINISTER MET WITH MOSLEM AND NON-MOSLEM HEADS OF MISSION IN BAGHDAD IN WHICH HE ASSURED THEM THAT IRAQ WOULD CONTINUE IN ITS NUCLEAR PROGRAM WHICH HE SAID WAS FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES. IS THAT ESSENTIALL WHAT HE TOLD THE AMERICAN HEAD OF MISSION? IN OTHER WORDS, CAN WE EXTRAPOLATE THAT?
A. I CAN'T GET INTO THE NATURE OF THE DETAILS OF THE CONVERSATION THAT HE HAD WITH OUR DIPLOMAT THERE.
Q. MEAN, DO YOU HAVE ANY REASON TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT OIL SUPPLIES, IN LIGHT OF THE ISRAELI RAID? IN OTHER WORDS, DO YOU HAVE ANY INDICATIONS THAT OIL SUPPLIES MAY BE JEO-

PARDIZED --
A. NO.
Q. I'M CONFUSED ABOUT AN ANSWER THAT YOU GAVE A FEW MINUTES AGO. WOULDN'T YOU HAVE TO KNOW THE ISRAELI HARD EVIDENCE ABOUT THE IRAQIS MAKING A BOMB IN ORDER TO MAKE A DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT A VIOLATION MAY HAVE OCCURRED? AS I UNDERSTAND THE LAW -- CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG -- IT WOULD HAVE TO BE AN OFFENSIVE ACT RATHER THATN A DEFENSIVE ACT FOR YOU TO DETERMINE THAT A VIOLATION MAY HAVE OCCURRED. SO WOULDN'T YOU HAVE TO KNOW WHAT THE ISRAELI EVIDENCE IS?
A. WELL, WHAT I MEAN TO SUGGEST IS THAT I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO A QUESTION OF WHAT WE KNEW, WHEN WE KNEW IT. WE THOUGHT WE HAD GOOD REASON TO MAKE THE STATEMENT WE DID; AND I JUST WANT TO LET IT STAND THERE.
Q. HENRY KISSINGER, I GATHER, IS NOW AT THE WHITE HOUSE. DO YOU HAVE ANY PLANS -- OR, IN FACT, HAS HE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT? DO YOU KNOW OF ANY PLANS OF

SENDING HIM AS A SPECIAL AMBASSADOR TO THE SCENE?
A. I AM NOT AWARE THAT HENRY KISSINGER IS AT THE WHITE HOUSE.
Q. WELL, IN GENERAL, ISTHERE ANY CONSIDERATION BEING GIVEN TO SENDING SOMEONE EITHER TO IRAQ OR TO THE AREA IN ORDER TO CONSULT WITH THE VAIOUS PARTIES TO THIS IN AN EFFORT TO TRY TO DEFUSE SOME OF THE TENSION THIS HAS CREATED?
A. I'VE NOT HEARD ANY SPECULATION ALONG THOSE LINES, NO.
Q. WHERE IS HABIB TODAY, AND HAVE YOU HAD ANY VIBRATIONS THAT HIS MISSION MAY HAVE BEEN COMPROMISED IN ANY FASHION BY THIS?

A. HE IS IN BEIRUT TODAY, AND I CAN ONLY REITERATE WHAT I SAID BEFORE: OUR HOPE IS THAT THAT MISSION WILL CONTINUE, THAT IT WILL SUCCEED, AND THAT ALL THE PARTIES AND COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN THE CIRSIS THAT HE HAS BEEN SENT THERE TO TRY TO HELP RESOLVE RECOGNIZE AS WE DO THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS CONTINUING HIS MISSION IN ORDER TO BRING RELATIVE PEACE AND STABILITY TO THE AREA.
Q. WITH WHOM IS HE MEETING?
A. I UNDERSTAND HE MET WITH PRESIDENT SARKIS.
Q. YESTERDAY.
A. YESTERDAY. I THINK YESTERDAY.
Q. ARE WE GETTING ANY NOTICE FROM ANY OF THE ARAB STATES THAT MAYBE HABIB OUGHT TO NOT COME?
A. NO, NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE.
Q. DEAN, ARE YOU AWARE OF A REQUEST BY ARAB NATIONS, AMBASSADORS IN WASHINGTON, TO MEET WITH THE SECRETARY? IS HE CONSIDERING A REQUEST LIKE THAT?
A. WELL, THE SECRETARY, AS YOU KNOW, IS LEAVING THIS EVENING FOR THE FAR EAST.
Q. HE'S NOT MEETING THEM THIS AFTERNOON?
A. NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO.

Q. WHY WAS THE CONDEMNATION ISSUED BEFORE THE LETTER ARRIVED?
A. I'VE ALREADY GONE INTO THE REASONS WHY I FELT THAT WE FOUND IT AN APPROPRIATE TIME TO ISSUE THE STATEMENT AT THE TIME WE DID. AND, AS I INDICATED EARLIER, WE HAD BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THE ISRAELIS PRIOR TO THE RECEIPT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S LETTER.
Q. ON THE MULTINATIONAL FORCE, SINCE AUSTRAILIA HAS PUBLISHED THE HAIG-STREET LETTERS, CAN YOU GIVE US SOME DETAILS ON THE FORCE? CAN YOU CONFIRM THAT THE U.S. HAS APPROACHED 13 COUNTRIES? DO YOU EXPECT THE ISRAELI RAID TO COMPLICATE THE FORMATION OF THE CFRCE, AND WILL SECRETARY HAIG DISCUSS THE FORCE WITH THE ANZUS OFFICIALS NEXT WEEK?

A. I CAN'T CONFIRM WHAT THE AUSTRAILIAN FORCE HAS REPORTED -- I HAVEN'T SEEN IT -- NOR CAN I CONFORM THAT THE U.S. HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH 13 COUNTRIES. IT IS QUITE CONCEIVABLE THAT THE MULTINATIONAL FORCE WULD BE DISCUSSED BY THE SECRETARY WHEN HE VISITS AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.
Q. LEAN, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING ON TEH LETTER THAT DEPUTY SECRETARY CLARK WROTE TO THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT ABOUT TWO WEEKS AGO AT A MEETING THAT HE HAD LAST WEEK WITH AMBASSADOR EVRON COMPLAINING ABOUT THE "UNWARRANTED" LOBBYING EFFORT BEING MADE BY ISRAEL AGAINST THE AWACS?
A. I'M NOT DENYING IT, BUT I'M NOT DISCUSSING ANY OF THE DETAILS.
Q. IS THERE UNHAPPINESS IN THIS BUILDING ABOUT THE "UNWARRANTED" LOBBYING EFFORT BEING DIRECTED BY ISRAEL AND ITS SUPPORTERS AGAINST THE SALE OF THE AWACS?

A. WELL, I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO A DESCRIPTION OF STATE OF UNHAPPINESS OR HAPPINESS IN THE BUILDING.
Q. WELL, IS IT TRUE? MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT SECRETARY CLARK TOLD AMBASSADOR EVRON THAT ISRAEL HAD AGREED IN FEBRUARY, AT THE TIME FOREIGN MINISTER SHAMIR WAS HERE, NOT TO PROTEST THE SALE TO SAUDI ARABIA. IS THAT THE VIEW OF THIS BUILDING?
A. WELL, THE ONLY THING I CAN SAY WITH RESPECT TO THE VISIT TO THE FOREIGN MINISTER IS THAT THE SUBJECT WAS DISCESSED WE EXPRESSED OUR VIEW AND HE EXPRESSED HIS.
Q. BUT THE ISRAELIS, OF COURSE, ARE SAYING THAT THAT APPLIED ONLY TO THE F-16 ENHANCEMENT PACKAGE AND NOT TO THE AWACS. IS IT THE STATE DEPARTMENT VIEW THAT THAT APPLIED TO BOTH THE AWACS AND THE F-16 ENHANCEMENT?
A. I JUST CAN'T GET INTO THE DETAILS OR THE SPECIFICS OF THE NATURE OF THE CONVERSATION THAT WAS HELD WITH THE FOREIGN MINISTER.
Q. DID HE MEET WITH EVRON ABOUT IT?
A. DID WHO MEET WITH EVRON?
Q. CLARK. LAST FRIDAY.
A. LAST FRIDAY? I DONT' KNOW. I DON'T KNOW IF HE DID OR NOT.
Q. LEAN, THIS LAST CASE OF THE AWACS -- NOT REALLY EXPECTING THE ISRAELI STRIKE ON THE ATOMIC FACILITY -- DOES

IT GIVE THE ADMINISTRATION A BETTER CHANCE THAT THE SALE OF THESE AWACS IS FOR THE ARABIANS?
A. WELL, HERE AGAIN, I THINK THESE ARE TWO SEPARATE, UNRELATED USSUES. I WOULDN'T WANT TO SPECULATE ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT IT IMPROVES OR MAKES MORE DIFFICULT THE SALE.
Q. YES. THE ARGUMENT AGAINST IT FROM "PRO-ISRAELI ELE-

MENTS" IS THAT IT WOULD REALLY TAKE AWAY THE PREEMPTIVE CAPABILITY A LITTLE WHICH IS, AGAIN, "NECESSARY FOR ITS INTERESTS AND SECURITY." AND HERE THESE PLANES DII GO FOR ABOUT 1200 MILES AND THEY WERE NOT DETECTED. DOES THAT GIVE A BETTER CASE FOR THEM DO YOU THINK.
A. WELL, I JUST DON'T CARE TO COMMENT ON THAT.
Q. NOW YOU'RE REVIEWING THE ARMS-SALE POLICY. I'M WONDERING: IS THERE ANY THOUGHT BEIGN GIVEN TO REVIEWING THE RATHER LOOSE -- ACCORDING TO THE WASHINGTON POST TODAY -- NON-PROLIFERATION POLICY OF THIS ADMINISTRATION?
A. YES, THAT'S CORRECT. WE ARE REVIEWING IT.
Q. DID THE RAID PRECIPITATE THE REVIEW OR DID IT START BEFORE?
A. OH, NO. IT'S BEEN IN PROGRESS LONG BEFORE THE ATTACK.
Q. DO YOU KNOW WHAT INITIATED IT.
A. THE REVIEW?
Q. YES.
A. WELL, I PRESUME IT'S THE FACT THAT THIS IS A NEW ADMINISTRATION AND IT WISHED TO PROMULGATE ITS OWN POLICIES.
UNCLASSIFIED

Q. THAT'S WHY I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY THE F-16S ARE SINGLED OUT THEN. EITHER THERE'S A POLICY ON ARMS DELIVERY BECAUSE OF THE IRAQI RAID OR THERE ISN'T.
A. WELL, I DON'T WANT TO LEAVE YOU WITH THE IMPRESSION THAT A DECISION HAS BEEN MADE TO REVIEW UR ARMS POLICY TO ISRAEL. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT --
Q. THAT'S WHAT THE PENTAGON SAID.
A. I THINK THIS CAME UP YESTERDAY IN THE CONTEXT OF ALL THE VARIOUS OPTIONS TFAT ARE AVAILABLE TO THIS ADMINISTRATION IN LOOKING AT THIS MATTER, AND THAT'S ONE OPTION. BUT I DO NOT WANT TO LEAVE YOU WITH THE IMPRESSION THAT A DECISION HAS BEEN MADE TO REVIEW UR ENTIRE ARMS POLICY WITH RESPECT TO ISRAEL .
Q. IS SUCH A REVIEW UNDER CONSIDERATION, UNDER ACTIVE CONSIDERATION?
A. IT'S ONE OF THE OPTIONS THAT IS OBVIOUSLY ABAILABLE TO THIS ADMINISTRATION.
Q. IS IT BEING ACTIVELY CONSIDERED?
A. I DON'T KNOW. STOESSEL
UNCLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED